Breakout group #2

Should the 4 current 4 identified customers continue to be funded, focal projects for DMAC (& IOOS)?

Rankings of current projects as DMAC priorities

1 = highest importance

4 = lowest importance

Customer	Votes	Rank
CI	1,1,1,1,1,2,2,2	1.375
HABS	3,2,3,2,2,4,3,3	2.75
HI	2,3,2,3,4,3,4,4	3.125
IEA	4,4,4,4,3,1,1,1 (!!)	2.75

CI priorites

- Make SLOSH output “DMAC” available in real time. (OPeNDAP)
- Wave model outputs (e.g. FNMOC models via GODAE Server)
- A model intercomparison framework
- Visualization? Should we fund it? Or merely “enable” it? Clear requirement is visuals to “sell” the project and tools for the modeler/analysts

CI priorites

- Need for data to support hindcasting experiments
- Able to utilize the data in their existing analysis and visualization software (DMAC investments sould be in *general* solutions)

Philosophy

- DMAC's focus in providing observations is to reach the analysts (modelers, scientists, …)
- IOOS' role reaches the end users
  - Note: DMAC may have a significant role getting products to products users

HABS priorities
(note: not actually #2 ranked)

- Going forward HABS needs to be regarded as a community (not just a NOAA project)
- DMAC to facilitate additional data feeds
  - Ocean color
  - Biogeochemical parameters
    - RT Ship observations to get onto GTS plus an Internet delivery mechanism provided for them

Existing data providers
NDBC, CO-OPS, CoastWatch

- Continue “some level” of funding to ultimately get *all* relevant data served through DMAC approaches

---- BUT -----

“Not invest another cent on SOS until …” we sort out the big picture

- Consistent schema across communities
- Tested on realistic volume data accessess
- Accessible through multiple meaningful clients (climate reference libraries)